

**REMARKS**

Claims 1-20 are pending. By this Amendment, claims 1, 7, 13 and 17 are amended.

Applicants appreciate the courtesies shown to Applicants' representative by Examiner Lewis during the October 12 telephone interview. Applicants' separate record of the substance of the interview is incorporated into the following remarks.

Entry of the amendments is proper under 37 CFR §1.116 since the amendments: (a) place the application in condition for allowance for the reasons discussed herein; (b) do not raise any new issue requiring further search and/or consideration since the amendments amplify issues previously discussed throughout prosecution; (c) satisfy a requirement of form asserted in the previous Office Action; (d) do not present any additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims; and (e) place the application in better form for appeal, should an appeal be necessary. The amendments are necessary and were not earlier presented because they are made in response to arguments raised in the final rejection. Entry of the amendments is thus respectfully requested.

**I. The Claims Define Patentable Subject Matter**

The Office Action rejects claims 1-20 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Gates (U.S. Patent No. 6,531,997 B1) in view of Inoue (JP 401086116A). The rejection is respectfully traversed.

In particular, neither Gates nor Inoue, individually or in combination, disclose or suggest a time period in which the voltage is applied that contributes to the image display overlaps with a time period in which the voltage is applied that does not contribute to the image display, as recited in independent claim 1, and similarly recited in independent claims 7, 13 and 17.

The Office Action appears to admit that Gates does not disclose or suggest the above noted-features of the claimed invention. For example, on page 3, the Office Action asserts

that Gates discloses "a positive pulse addressing signal 16 preceding the negative pulse 18 so long as the negative pulse does not have sufficient amplitude to cause the particles to move...." (emphasis added).

Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that Gates does not disclose or suggest a time period in which the voltage is applied that contributes to the image display overlaps with a time period in which the voltage is applied that does not contribute to the image display, as claimed in claims 1, 7, 13 and 17.

Inoue does not make up for the above-noted deficiencies of Gates. Inoue discloses in Fig. 1 that the elements 1 are glass sheets of an electrophoretic display device. Nowhere does Inoue disclose or suggest the features of claims 1, 7, 13 and 17.


Thus, independent claims 1, 7, 13 and 17 define patentable subject matter. Claims 2-6, 8-12, 14-16 and 18-20 depend from the respective independent claims, and therefore also define patentable subject matter. Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) is respectfully requested.

## **II. Conclusion**

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and prompt allowance of claims 1-20 are earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further would be desirable in order to place this application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number set forth below.

Respectfully submitted,



James A. Oliff  
Registration No. 27,075

Yong S. Choi  
Registration No. 43,324

JAO:YSC/jam

Date: October 14, 2004

**OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC**  
**P.O. Box 19928**  
**Alexandria, Virginia 22320**  
**Telephone: (703) 836-6400**

**DEPOSIT ACCOUNT USE  
AUTHORIZATION**

Please grant any extension  
necessary for entry;  
Charge any fee due to our  
Deposit Account No. 15-0461